



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/432,853	11/02/1999	WILLIAM MICHAEL ZINTEL	3382-53696	1670

7590 11/08/2002

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN CAMPBELL  
LEIGH & WHINSTON LLP  
ONE WORLD TRADE CENTER SUITE 1600  
121 SW SALMON STREET  
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER

VU, VIET DUY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 11/08/2002

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/432,853

Applicant(s)

Zintel et al

Examiner

Viet Vu

Art Unit

2154



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on Oct 22, 2002

2a)  This action is FINAL. 2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

4)  Claim(s) 1-6 and 23-38 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) 23-38 is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8)  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a)  approved b)  disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)  Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)  All b)  Some\* c)  None of:

1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)  Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

a)  The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)  Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 4,5

6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. The current title is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

**Art Rejections:**

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Krishnamurthy et al, U.S. pat. No. 6,389,464.

Krishnamurthy discloses a memory structure for storing a table representing an operational state of a computing device comprising

a plurality of entries, each entry comprises an identifier, a current value and a default value (see col 10, lines 59-64 and fig. 6).

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1-3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cannon et al, U.S. pat. No. 6,334,178, in view of Krishnamurthy.

Per claims 1 and 3, Cannon discloses a distributed computing network comprising:

a) a controlled/managed computing device (400, fig. 4),

- b) a state table (406) maintaining by the controlled device and representing an operational state of the controlled device (see Cannon's col 6, lines 46-50),
- c) a controller interface (404, fig. 2) having input/output capability for enabling interaction with remote user (Cannon's col 6, lines 41-45),
- d) a control module (402, fig. 4) operating to access the state table and subscribe to change notifications of the state table (Cannon's col 6, lines 51-66),
- e) an event module (300, fig. 3) for distributing the change notifications to any subscribing controlled device upon a change to the operational state if the controlled computing device (see Cannon's col 9, lines 6-24).

Cannon does not explicitly show a user interface for enabling interactions between user and controlled device. The use of a user interface for allowing user to operate and/or configure the controlled/managed device is well known in the art as disclosed by Krishnamurthy (see Krishnamurthy col 11, lines 25-38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide such user interface in Cannon because it would have allowed user to operate and/or configure the controlled/managed device.

Serial No. 09/432,853

Per claims 2 and 6, Krishnamurthy also discloses a memory structure for storing a table representing an operational state of a computing device comprising a plurality of entries, each entry comprises an identifier, a current value and a default value (see Krishnamurthy's col 10, lines 59-64 and fig. 6).

**Allowable Subject Matter:**

7. Claims 23-38 are allowed over prior art of record.

**Conclusion:**

8. The references cited by the examiner on PTO-892 but not relied upon are considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Viet Vu whose telephone number is (703) 305-9597. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8:00am to 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An, can be reached on (703) 305-9678.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.



VIET D. VU  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Art Unit 2154  
11/1/02